



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/550,081	09/19/2005	Aster De Schrijver	05261-PCT-PA	1440
72468	7590	07/11/2008		EXAMINER
HODES, PESSIN & KATZ, P.A.				NGO, LIEN M
901 DULANEY VALLEY ROAD, SUITE 400				
BALTIMORE, MD 21204			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3754	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/11/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/550,081	Applicant(s) DE SCHRIJVER, ASTER
	Examiner LIEN TM NGO	Art Unit 3754

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 April 2008.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,4-11 and 15-17 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1, 4-11 and 15-17 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/146/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The amendment filed 4/10/08 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132(a) states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: in the specifications: "FIG. 5 shows a valve with a dual grommet and a spring", and in the drawing: new FIG. 5 is added, which introduce new matter because the detailed features of a valve with a dual grommet and a spring, as shown in new fig. 5, is not supported in the ordinal disclosure.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Drawings

2. The proposed drawing correction of drawings, filed 4/10/08, have been disapproved because they introduce new matter into the drawings. 37 CFR 1.121 (a) (6) states that no amendment may introduce new matter into the disclosure of an application. The original disclosure does not support the showing of the detailed features of a valve with a dual grommet and a spring, as shown in new fig. 5.
3. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the metal spring or plastic spring in claim 9 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

4. Figures 1a and 1b should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claim 1, 4-11 and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, it cannot be determined what comprises the invention. Claim 1 is defined a valve, but the body claim positively recites structural element of the content of the container (at least partly, in contact with the content of the container). Is the invention a valve or a valve/content of the container combination?

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. Claims 1 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Benda et al. (5,353,427). Benda et al. disclose a valve comprising a grommet having at on part made of non-thermoplastic adhering to another part made of a thermoplastic material by a method of dual injection technique.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 1, 10, 11 and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Turk (2,992,760) in view of Benda et al.. Turk discloses, in figs. 1 and 2, a tilting valve which cable of dispensing a polyurethane foam comprising a grommet made from elastic rubber 32 (non-thermoplastic rubber) and a rigid plastic material 64 (thermoplastic material), and a spring 26.

Turk does not disclose the grommet comprising the elastic rubber adhering or dual injecting to rigid plastic material.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the Turk grommet comprising the elastic rubber adhering or dual injecting to rigid plastic material, as taught by Benda, in order to form in one piece of a grommet with two different material.

It has been held that forming in one piece an article which has formerly formed in two pieces and put together involves only routine skill in the art. Howard v. Detroit Stove Works, 150 U.S 164 (1893).

11. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Turk in view of Benda et al.. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make grommet in the invention of Turk in view of Benda et al. from EPDM as the non-thermoplastic rubber part and Trefsin or Santoprene as thermoplastic material part, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice (In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416).

12. Claims 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Turk in view of Benda et al. and further in view of Shimizu et al. (JP 2000-109748).

A silicone base position is using for coating a surface of sealing material, which is well known in the art, as taught by Shimizu et al., for water resistance, air tightness, etc.; therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to coat the grommet of Softer et al.

or Turk. With silicone base composition, as taught by Shimizu et al., in order to enhance the sealing property of the grommet.

13. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Turk in view of Benda et al. and further in view of Kellner (5,927,563).

Kellner teaches, in figs.1, a spring pressing an enlarged base of a stem again a grommet.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a spring as claimed in the invention of Turk in view of Benda et al., as taught by Kellner, in order to press the base stem against the grommet in the non-dispensing position of the valve.

Response to Arguments

14. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 4-11 and 15-17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

15. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LIEN TM NGO whose telephone number is 571-272-4545. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM -6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, KEVIN SHAVER can be reached on 571-272-4720. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/LIEN TM NGO/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3754

July 9, 2008